

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	8:01CR163
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	<b>ORDER</b>
ROBERT E. WATKINS,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

The defendant's most recent motion for return of seized property will be denied because he has been granted all the relief he is entitled to receive and he has failed to show that the government and the Omaha police department have failed to comply with my previous order.

Despite the contrary suggestion of the defendant in his most recent motion, it is not Officer Kyle's responsibility to make arrangements for return of the seized property. Since he is in prison, the defendant must properly designate (in form acceptable to the government) someone to pick up the property.

From what the defendant has most recently submitted (filing 220, attachment), the defendant sent a demand letter for return of property to the Omaha police department, but he failed to designate anyone to pick up the property. Moreover, there is no showing that anyone designated by the defendant to pick up his property has ever appeared to do so.

IT IS ORDERED that the defendant's motion (filing 220) is denied. The defendant is further notified that subsequent motions of this kind will be denied summarily.

January 5, 2006.

BY THE COURT:

*s/ Richard G. Kopf*  
United States District Judge